STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS	)	
	)	
Petition for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act, and an Order pursuant to Section 8-503 of the Public Utilities Act, to Construct, Operate and Maintain a New High Voltage Electric Service Line and Related Facilities in the Counties of Adams, Pike, Brown, Schuyler, Cass, Fulton, Morgan, Sangamon, Shelby, Montgomery, Christian, Scott, Moultrie, Macon, Coles, Clark, Edgar and Champaign, Illinois.	)	Docket No. 12-0598

REPLY BRIEF ON REHEARING OF
AMEREN TRANSMISSION COMPANY OF ILLINOIS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. Legal Standard

III. Project Connection through Kincaid versus Pana

ATXI's Initial Brief on Rehearing explains three reasons why a Pana connection is technically superior to a Kincaid connection:

- The Pana routes will address Decatur reliability needs by 2016. The Kincaid route cannot be completed until at least 2018, which is too late;
- The Pana routes will provide improved stability to the Coffeen plant; and
- The Pana routes will enable the Pana substation relocation at a fraction of the cost to customers, as compared to building the Kincaid route and relocating the substation separately.

Staff disputes none of this. Rather than address the technical and operational merits of the connections, Staff claims that a Pawnee to Kincaid to Mt. Zion route "would result in the lowest overall costs." (Staff. Br. on Rh'g at 3, *see also* at 11.) Staff's observation is true as far is it goes; looking *only* at the cost of constructing a transmission line between Kincaid and Mt. Zion, the Kincaid connection would require the expenditure of fewer dollars than the Pana connection. But this is a false comparison, for the simple reason that the Pana connection meets the service needs of the Project and the other Kincaid option does not. Comparing these options by dollar costs is an irrelevant and unproductive exercise.

ATXI has already explained that in determining which option is "least cost," the operative statute requires the Commission to consider the service needs of the Project. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 6-7.) All parties agree (and the Commission has already found) that there is a need for a contiguous transmission line. (Order at 14.) These are not the only service needs. Staff does not dispute the need to address reliability in the Decatur area by 2016. It does not dispute that improving stability at the Coffeen generating plant is a goal of the Project. And it

does not dispute that relocating the Pana substation would be cheaper for Ameren Illinois area customers if the relocation occurs as part of the Project. These service needs must be taken into consideration in determining a route.

There are many shortcomings in Staff's technical comparison of the Kincaid and Pana connections, including instances where Staff does not accurately describe the record. Aside from these failings, and assuming all of the technical challenges to connecting at Kincaid can be overcome, one fact dictates the Commission reject this option: the work necessary to complete the Kincaid connection cannot be completed in time to address Decatur area service and reliability issues by 2016. Staff claims the "record does not reflect whether a Pawnee to Kincaid to Mt. Zion connection could be completed more quickly if necessary studies were given priority," (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4), but this is false: ATXI explained that a Pawnee to Kincaid to Mt. Zion connection cannot be completed by 2016 regardless of the priority given to any studies. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), pp. 8-9.) The most optimistic scenario places completion of a Kincaid connection at 2018, which is simply too late.

With all of this said, ATXI will now address each of the five technical points that Staff addresses in its brief.

Assuming the modifications to the Kincaid substation can be made, these modifications will not address the service needs of the Project.

Staff claims that modifications to the Kincaid substation "could lead to the elimination of . . . existing Kincaid operating issues while achieving the benefits of four of MISO's Multi-Value Projects at lower cost." (ICC Staff Ex. 3.0, p. 6.) This is not correct. Addressing operating concerns at Kincaid would occur, if at all, *at the expense* of intended MVP benefits, as ATXI explained in its Initial Brief on Rehearing.

That the Kincaid connection *will* require modification of the Kincaid substation (not just

"might" as Staff suggests) is not ATXI's greatest concern. ATXI explained that physical and electrical modifications will be necessary. (ATXI Ex. 4.0 (RH), p. 4.) Any number of additional modifications may also be required after any system impact studies are complete. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 3.) But the concern is not that it would be impossible to connect at Kincaid, although there are significant technical challenges that would need to be overcome at as yet unknown costs; the concern—and this is not disputed—is that it will not be possible to complete the connection before it is needed in 2016 to address Decatur area reliability issues. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 7-9.) Consequently, a Kincaid connection will not meet the objective of addressing Decatur area reliability issues by 2016—an undisputed benefit of the Project. It is also undisputed that a Kincaid connection would not provide the additional stability to the Coffeen plant. (*Id.* at 9-10.) Thus, while Staff speculates that substation modifications "could" eliminate operating concerns at Kincaid, what is certain is that none of these modifications would address the full set of service needs addressed by the Project.

It is necessary to relocate the Pana substation regardless of who pays; that Ameren Illinois area customers will pay less if the relocation occurs as part of the Illinois Rivers Project deserves consideration.

Staff does not question that Ameren Illinois area customers will bear the full cost of relocating the Pana substation if the relocation occurs as a separate reliability project, a point confirmed during the questioning of ATXI witness Mr. Dennis Kramer by the ALJs. (Tr. 123) What it questions is whether mine subsidence is really occurring, and whether the Commission should even take into consideration how MVP cost sharing works. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 3.)

As to whether mine subsidence is occurring, Staff's characterization of ATXI's testimony is misleading. ATXI witness Mr. Jeffrey Hackman explained that subsidence is occurring 1000 feet to the northwest of the existing substation and 2000 feet to the east. (ATXI Ex. 9.0 (RH), pp. 3-4.) While the Pana substation itself is not sinking (yet), the substation sits between two

areas that are and there is a high probability that significant subsidence will occur. *(Id.* at 4.) The subsidence could happen suddenly and without warning, leading to dramatic consequences such as equipment failure and customer outages of undetermined magnitude and duration. (*Id.*) Based on the uncertainty of the costs and the inability to forecast the effectiveness of any stabilization plans, the decision was made to relocate the existing AIC Pana substation to an area that has not been mined. (*Id.*) ATXI witness Ms. Maureen Borkowski testified the determination of mine subsidence was made following consultation with Illinois Department of Natural Resources mining subsidence experts and after considering options to stabilize the substation. (ATXI Ex. 10.0 (RH), p. 6.) The engineering and independent expert judgment supported the determination that the existing AIC Pana substation needs to be relocated. (*Id.*)

In response to questions by the ALJs, Mr. Kramer explained that because transformers are the heaviest pieces of equipment, they would likely sink first. (Tr. 124-25.) Transformers are also the most expensive equipment at a substation. (*Id.*) Once the transformers fail, the entire substation will fail. (*Id.*) But this serious risk can be avoided by relocation. And Staff agrees that "it would not be prudent to place additional transmission facilities at Pana" and that a "new substation outside of the area of mine subsidence is logical." (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 3; ICC Staff Ex. 1.0R (Rev.), p. 37.) Further, the evidence Mr. Rockrohr considered and accepted in agreeing that the Pawnee substation should be relocated due to mine subsidence is not materially different than what has been offered regarding the Pana substation. (*Compare* ICC Staff Ex. 1.0(R), p. 34, *with* ATXI Ex. 10.0 (RH), p. 6.) Common sense, therefore, not to mention sound engineering practice, suggests that the need to avoid subsidence would apply to both existing and new transmission equipment.

Thus, contrary to Staff's claim "there is no evidence that the relocation work at Pana is

necessary," (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 3), there *is* ample evidence that relocation is necessary—in the form of testimony from the ATXI witnesses regarding consultation with IDNR and other analysis undertaken in figuring out where the subsidence is occurring and what should be done about it.

Staff then claims "it is appropriate to consider whether it would be fair for utilities in other states to perform unnecessary work simply because ratepayers in Illinois will help pay the cost." (*Id.* at 4.) No one is suggesting that ATXI relocate the Pana substation solely because the cost would be shared. There is a *need* to relocate the substation, independent of who pays for it. If the relocation occurs as part of the Project, the costs will be shared. If the relocation occurs as a separate local reliability project, Ameren Illinois area customers will pay 100% of the cost. Like it or not, the Commission's decision will have consequences to customers. Those consequences should not be ignored.

Whether a Mt. Zion to Kansas connection would address Decatur reliability concerns by 2016 is sheer speculation. Connecting at the Moweaqua substation is an inferior solution to Decatur reliability.

Staff's third technical point actually addresses two points. Before addressing them it is necessary to correct a few mischaracterizations. First, to say that ATXI did not "fully consider" a Kincaid connection before filing its petition ignores the fact that this connection is *Staff's* idea, not ATXI's. The reason the MVPs were approved to connect in Pana has already been explained; to address Decatur reliability and to improve stability at the Coffeen plant, along with delivering the other Project benefits. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 7-10.) Neither ATXI nor MISO should be faulted for not anticipating and "fully considering" what Staff is proposing in this case; a route that does not address the identified service needs. Moreover, the evidence shows that MISO's modeling did in fact consider opportunities and challenges in ComEd and neighboring systems during the MVP process discussed below.

Mr. Kramer explained the MVPs that make up the Project are the product of a process that stretches back over 5 years—beginning with the MISO Regional Generation Outlet Study (RGOS) in 2008—to investigate how best to fulfill various state renewable energy requirements or targets reliably and efficiently by accessing wind resources located across the MISO footprint. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), pp. 3-5.) The RGOS study was the first step in the lengthy and detailed analysis of the transmission system that eventually led to the identification and subsequent MISO Board of Director's approval of the transmission projects identified as MVPs in the MISO MTEP11 Appendix A. (*Id.*)

Importantly, the Kincaid generation facility and substation were included as part of that study process. The "MISO Regional Generation Outlet Study" dated November 19, 2010, states, "The study region consists of Midwest ISO and neighboring facilities including MAPP, Commonwealth Edison, and American Electric Power." (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 4 (quoting the MISO Regional Generation Outlet Study).) Thus, the ComEd transmission system was included in the scope of the study. The RGOS analysis used models representing the Eastern Interconnection and "[e]xternal transmission system representation . . . provided by the Eastern Interconnection Reliability Assessment Group (ERAG) Multi-Regional Modeling Working Group (MMWG) North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC) models, except for the non-Midwest ISO MRO members, where the latest Midwest Reliability Organization (MRO) models were used. Commonwealth Edison and American Electric Power (AEP) supplied system updates directly to the RGOS study effort for their respective transmission systems." (*Id.* at 4-5.) The RGOS Report analyses provided multiple single line system diagrams with potential transmission lines in MISO, ComEd and AEP territories. (*Id.*) Therefore, the Kincaid substation and its operational parameters were included in the models that were used to develop the RGOS

set of potential projects, which were then further analyzed and refined to develop the final MVP portfolio of projects. The results of the RGOS analysis and MVP development process *did not identify a connection through Kincaid substation as being necessary or appropriate.* (*Id.* at 5.)

Whatever one thinks of how comprehensive the MVP process was, rehearing in this case has produced a substantial volume of data for weighing the pros and cons of connecting in Kincaid. To suggest that ATXI objects to the Kincaid connection because ATXI "had not fully considered" it is wrong. ATXI objects because it *has* considered this connection and identified serious shortcomings with it. Further study will not eliminate the shortcomings.

Staff then prefaces its technical discussion by claiming, "the record does not reflect whether [the Kincaid connection] could be completed more quickly if necessary studies were given priority . . . ." (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4.) This is simply not true. ATXI witnesses Messrs. Kramer and Hackman explained why the study process would take at least 12 to 15 months, possibly longer. (ATXI Exs. 1.0 (RH), p. 17; 2.0 (RH), p. 30.) And Mr. Kramer addressed this exact question—pointing out that far simpler studies were given "high priority" and still took at least nine months to complete. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 8.) ATXI would certainly be willing to give the Project its full priority; the problem is, the system impact studies also require the cooperation of PJM and ComEd, neither of whose cooperation ATXI is in a position to demand—as evidenced by the timing of other studies requiring their cooperation. (*Id.* at 8-9.) Mr. Rockrohr acknowledges he has not contacted representatives of either MISO or PJM. (ATXI Cross Ex. 2, p. 2.) There is absolutely no evidence that the studies could be completed earlier than ATXI has represented.

This leads to Staff's specific technical points. The first is that ATXI could build a line between Kansas and Mt. Zion that would address Decatur area reliability before 2016. (ICC

Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4.) Although possible, accelerating Kansas to Mt. Zion could expose the existing transmission system to congestion or system overloads, and would be an inferior solution from a post-contingency voltage recovery standpoint. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 9.)

As has been previously explained, the in-service dates shown on ATXI Exhibit 2.4 are the end result of a joint MISO and ATXI analysis to determine the sequence that minimized the number of temporary system conditions that would cause system congestion and system overloads. (*Id.*) The current sequence addresses these impacts. Accelerating the in-service date of the Kansas to Mt. Zion area substation 345 kV line may result in system overloads that can only be mitigated by implementing other new system reinforcements, at unknown additional cost. (*Id.*)

And even if Kansas to Mt. Zion can be accelerated, a Pana connection provides a higher level of post-contingency voltage recovery at every Mt. Zion substation option during 2016-2018, compared to supplying the Mt. Zion area substation from a 345 kV line from Kansas. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 10.)

Staff's other point is that a Moweaqua substation could address Decatur reliability issues, because it could connect to an existing 138 kV line that already connects to the Decatur area. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4.) But without constructing additional 138 kV lines from Moweaqua to Decatur, Moweaqua, located 17 miles southwest of the Decatur area, provides significantly less voltage support to Decatur. Under each combination of Mt. Zion substation location, 345 kV supply line(s), and 138 kV connections to the Decatur area that ATXI evaluated, whether in 2016 – 2018 or after 2018, a substation at Moweaqua provides less voltage support to Decatur as compared to ATXI's Mt. Zion substation or Staff substation site Option #2. (ATXI Exs. 4.1 (RH)-4.4 (RH); Staff Cross Ex. 2.) When the approximately 54MW of load to be added by

Archer Daniels Midland in 2016 is considered, the result would be even lower post-recovery voltages in Decatur. (Staff Cross Ex. 2; Tr. 119.) This could drive post-contingency recovery voltages for the 2016 contingency scenarios using Moweaqua below 90% (the threshold below which there is significant risk of voltage collapse and loss of load). (*See* ATXI Ex. 4.0 (RH), p. 7; ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (ENG 13.08 Attach. 7).) Even with additional 138 kV lines installed from Moweaqua to Decatur, Staff substation site Option #2 (and ATXI's original site) would still be superior by comparison, as Staff admits. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 11.) Finally, while a Moweaqua connection provides inferior performance compared to the other Mt. Zion substation site locations, the Moweaqua connection also does not result in any cost savings as compared to connecting to Staff substation site Option #2, since it would still require construction of a new substation and additional 138 kV lines just as Staff substation site Option #2 would.

As explained in the "Location of Mt. Zion Substation" section below, Staff's analysis of a Moweaqua substation also fails to consider the fact that a Kincaid connection will not be completed until 2018 at the earliest. But any scenario assuming a Moweaqua substation (or any Mt. Zion substation) must consider what will happen in 2016, when the considerable additional ADM load must be served. In 2016, one possibility (which would resolve Decatur reliability issues) would be a Pana to Mt. Zion 345 kV line. Another possibility (which might, or might not, resolve Decatur reliability issues) would be an accelerated Kansas to Mt. Zion 345 kV line. Under both scenarios, Moweaqua performs worse in terms of voltage support than a substation at the Staff substation site Option #2—the site stipulated to by the Village of Mt. Zion. So, while Staff criticizes ATXI's analyses of Moweaqua as not representing conditions that would actually exist because they show only one 345 kV line into Moweaqua (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 10), the opposite is true: ATXI's analyses very much reflect conditions that would actually exist during a

wait between 2016 and 2018 for a Kincaid connection to be built. Those same analyses hold if a Pana connection is approved but uses the Moweaqua site: Moweaqua performs worse than all other Mt. Zion substations for the Pana connection as well.

Modifications to the Kincaid substation could address potential overloads at Mt. Zion – but this doesn't change the fact that Kincaid cannot be completed soon enough.

According to Staff, ATXI's concerns about potential overloads to the Mt. Zion substation can be addressed when modifications are made to the Kincaid substation. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4-5.) As already explained in response to Staff's first technical point, however, a Kincaid connection cannot be made before 2016. That overloading *might be* addressed by the modifications does not change the basic fact that Kincaid cannot be completed by 2016.

A Kincaid connection will not improve stability at the Coffeen plant.

Staff acknowledges ATXI's concern that a Kincaid connection using Staff's substation sites Options 1 or 2 would not improve stability at the Coffeen plant. (*Id.* at 5.) Mr. Kramer testified the Pana connection improves the ability of the Coffeen power plant to withstand certain transmission system disturbances and remain connected to the grid by 10%. (ATXI Ex. 1.0 (RH), pp. 8-9.) In contrast, the Kincaid connection using Staff's substation sites Options 1 or 2 provides no improvement in the ability of the Coffeen power plant to withstand these same transmission system disturbances. (*Id.*)

Staff suggests that the third option of siting the new Mt. Zion substation at Moweaqua and connecting to an existing AIC 138 kV line that connects Decatur to Pana would provide additional stability to the Coffeen plant. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 4; ICC Staff Ex. 3.0, p. 9.) Staff offers no analysis or study in support for its opinion. Mr. Kramer testified that locating the new Mt. Zion substation at Moweaqua and connecting it to the existing Pana to Decatur Route 51 138 kV line would at best provide minimal *if any* improvement in the stability of the Coffeen power

plant, and provides less improvement than the additional 345 kV Pana connections would provide. (ATXI Exhibit 8.0 (RH), pp. 12-13.)

The Pana connection is the least cost option.

The Pana connection is the least cost option for the simple reason that it is the *only* option that the parties *know* will meet all of the needs of the Project. Where one option meets the needs of a project and other options do not, the option that meets the needs is "least cost," regardless of dollar comparisons. *See, e.g., Union Elec. Co.*, Docket 01-0516, Order at 12-13 (Jan 15, 2002) (finding that construction of peaking asset and related facilities was the least-cost alternative where other options, including power purchases and distributed generation, were not sufficient to meet the identified service needs before a shortfall in capacity occurred); *Ameropan Oil Corp. v. Ill. Comm. Comm'n*, 298 Ill. App. 3d 341 (1st Dist. 1998) (holding, when two routes were available, but one might not allow the line to be in service to meet the expected load, the Commission's decision to approve the line that would be in service in time was supported by the record). In addition, a connection at Pana will allow for the relocation of facilities at the existing Pana substation due to mine subsidence to be included as a part of the total Project cost, resulting in a lower overall cost to Ameren Illinois area customers due to the MVP cost sharing. (ATXI Ex. 7.0 (RH), pp. 6-7.) A Kincaid connection will require the relocation costs to be borne solely by Ameren Illinois area customers. (*Id.*)

Whether any of the technical issues with the Kincaid connection can *eventually* be identified and overcome is irrelevant. Additional study of Kincaid will not change the outcome, but only increase the number of issues that need to be addressed and the cost of the connection. (ATXI Ex. 8.0 (RH), p. 6.) And regardless of what options were examined during the MISO RGOS and MVP analysis, the evidence on rehearing demonstrates the Project is the only solution to fully address the service needs of the Decatur area.

Just as important is the undue consequence of another proceeding—it means delay in customers receiving the Project benefits the Commission recognized in its August 2013 Order. The Project benefits cannot be fully realized unless all the connections are made, as Mr. Rockrohr agreed. (Tr. 250.) In addition, further proceedings will burden other parties with the need to again litigate routing questions before the Commission—questions that will simply repeat the ones at issue now. Some Intervenors have already raised this concern. (*See generally*, STPL Post-Hearing Reply Br. (filed June 10, 2013).)

In short, the Commission has what it needs to make a decision and should do so. Any questions of whether a Kincaid connection is a better alternative than Pana have been answered. The final order should grant a certificate that includes the Pana connection.

IV. Rehearing Routes

A. Meredosia-Pawnee

The question on rehearing is "why the Commission should change a previously entered order." *Commonwealth Edison*, Docket 12-0298, Order on Rh'g (Dec. 5, 2012), p. 29. As such, "any party desiring a change or modification to the existing [ruling] has the burden of proving that there should be a change . . . and that party has the burden of proving that its proposed change or changes . . . should be adopted." *Ill. Bell Tel. Co.*, Docket 01-0120, Order (July 10, 2002), p. 7. In its August 2013 Order, the Commission approved the Stipulated Route, finding the evidence supporting the MSSCLPG[1] Route insufficient to justify its approval over the Stipulated Route. (Order at 77.) That finding remains true today.

MSSCLPG sought rehearing to "present evidence as to any matters for which the record was unclear, uncertain, or incomplete, as to that segment between Meredosia and Pawnee."

[1] Morgan, Sangamon and Scott County Land Preservation Group.

(MSSCLPG App. For Rh'g at ¶ 2.) As discussed in ATXI's Initial Brief on Rehearing, however, MSSCLPG has not provided any new information that warrants reversal of the Commission's decision. (ATXI Br. On Rh'g at 13-20.) MSSCLPG now suggests it is ATXI that is required to "dispute or debunk" earlier evidence, *not* presented on rehearing, rather than MSSCLPG clarifying or completing the record. (MSSCLPG Br. on Rh'g at ¶¶ 3, 4, 5.) Not only is this an improper assignment of the burden of proof on rehearing; it ignores the history of this case. The Commission has already made a determination on many of the routing criteria based on the very evidence and arguments MSSCLPG raises now. (Order at 77.) For example, the Commission found that with respect to environmental impacts, impacts to historical resources, social and land use impacts and visual impacts, there is no material difference between the Stipulated Route and the MSSCLPG Route. (Order at 77; ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 18-20.)

Rather than provide the Commission with new (or additional) information on rehearing, MSSCLPG relies almost exclusively on evidence from the underlying case,[2] the very evidence the Commission has already considered (and found lacking). (Order at 63-66, 76-77.) MSSCLPG admits this, describing its evidence on rehearing as "reiterating" or "reaffirming" prior testimony. (MSSCLPG Br. on Rh'g at ¶4.) Indeed, MSSCLPG simply repeats, often verbatim, the same arguments made in its initial brief filed in the underlying proceeding. (*compare* MSSCLPG Br. *with* MSSCLPG Br. on Rh'g.)

The only new evidence presented by MSSCLPG on rehearing was an exhibit purporting to compare the number of "farm sites" and "improvements" along the Stipulated Route and the

[2] (MSSCLPG Br. on R'hg, ¶1 (length of line), ¶2 (difficulty and cost of construction), ¶3 (difficulty and cost of operation and maintenance), ¶4 (environmental impacts), ¶5 (impacts on historical resources), ¶6 (social and land use impacts), ¶10 (community acceptance), ¶11 (visual impact), ¶12 (presence of existing corridors).)

MSSCLPG Route, and measure their distance from each route.[3] (*See generally* MSSCLPG Ex. 11.1.) It is not clear from the exhibit or the accompanying testimony what a "farm site" is—a current or historical farm operation? A parcel on which a farm is or was located, or a structure? The exhibit itself does not provide any insight. As a result, the record in support of the MSSCLPG Route is no more developed on rehearing than it was in the initial proceeding. And so there is no evidence that warrants a reversal of the Commission's August 2013 Order.

ATXI presented additional evidence on rehearing confirming that the MSSCLPG Route was less preferable than the Stipulated Route because of the paralleling issue. (ATXI Br. On Rh'g at 13-20.) Specifically, the MSSCLPG Route increases the mileage of parallel transmission lines throughout the entire Project by approximately 70%. (ATXI Ex. 9.0 (RH), p. 8.) Paralleling at any point presents reliability, operational and maintenance concerns, but given the proposal to parallel the entire 57-mile length of the Meredosia to Pawnee line, these concerns are especially problematic. MSSCLPG did not present any evidence whatsoever concerning the problems associated with parallel transmission lines. MSSCLPG's witness—an engineer—acknowledged that reliability was a concern the Commission should consider, but beyond discussing the additional cost associated with the Stipulated Route, he offered no reason for the Commission to reverse its decision. (MSSCLPG Exs. 13.0, p. 1; 14.0, p. 2.)

Staff also supports the MSSCLPG Route, for no real reason other than it is shorter. (*See, e.g.* ICC Staff Ex. 3.0, pp. 2-3.) The Commission was well aware of the comparative length of the routes in the initial proceeding, but determined that a comprehensive view of the routing

[3] MSSCLPG also presented the testimony of Mr. Neimeyer who claims the Stipulated Route would impact planned development, specifically a subdivision and farm operations. (*See generally* MSSCLPG Ex. 7.0.) Mr. Neimeyer's claims were never substantiated. ATXI issued several data requests to Mr. Neimeyer information regarding these claims, but MSSCLPG was unable to produce the requested information or documentation. Thus, the Commission should not give any weight to his testimony.

criteria favored the Stipulated Route. (Order at 77.)

MSSCLPG has not met its burden of demonstrating that the August 2013 Order should be altered to approve the MSSCLPG Route.

1. **Length of Line**
2. **Difficulty and Cost of Construction**
3. **Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance**
4. **Environmental Impacts**
5. **Impacts on Historical Resources**
6. **Social and Land Use Impacts**
7. **Number of Affected Landowners and other Stakeholders**
8. **Proximity to Homes and Other Structures**
9. **Proximity to Existing and Planned Development**
10. **Community Acceptance**
11. **Visual Impact**
12. **Presence of Existing Corridors**

B. Location of Mt. Zion Substation

The parties' briefs confirm that Staff substation site Option #2 is acceptable to the parties with an interest in where the substation is located. (MCPO Br. on Rh'g at 8-9; PDM Br. on Rh'g at 5; Staff Br. on Rh'g at 9.)[4] The Village of Mount Zion has stipulated to approval of Staff substation site Option #2. In light of this broad agreement, the Commission should approve Staff

[4] The only party expressing concern about the location of Staff's substation site Option #2 is Intervenor Paula Cooley. She alleges that there is a Very High Frequency Omni Directional Radio Range (VOR) near Staff substation site Option #2, which she contends requires ATXI to notify the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). (Cooley Br. on Rh'g at 2-3.) However, notice to the FAA is only required if proposed construction will be more than 200 feet above ground level. 14 C.F.R. § 77.9(a). The Project's towers will not be more than 200 feet tall. (ATXI Ex. 9.0 (RH), p. 12.) In addition, federal guidelines suggest that structures be placed at least 1000 feet from VORs. FAA JO 7400.2J, 6-3-23. The VOR is located over 1200 feet from any portion of Staff substation site Option #2 or the lines into that substation. (ATXI Cross Ex. 1.)

substation site Option #2.

Staff, however, argues that a substation site near Moweaqua, 17 miles from Mt. Zion, would be a better location. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 10-11.) This position is, frankly, bewildering, given: (i) Staff's acknowledgement that its substation site Option #2 "would serve as [a] good substation site[]," (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 9); (ii) that Staff identified its substation site Option #2, as a possible substation site in its October 2013 identification of the Kincaid route, noting it was one proposed by the Village of Mount Zion (ICC Staff Ex. 5.0, ¶ 4); (iii) that Staff witness Mr. Rockrohr testified that he "supported[ed] a substation site south of the one ATXI proposes, *as the Village suggests,* … (ICC Staff Ex. 1.0R, p. 42 (emphasis added)); (iv) that Staff has not identified a single problem or concern associated with its substation site Option #2; and (v) the Village of Mount Zion's stated preference for Staff substation site Option #2. (Stip. Ex. 1 (RH).) In fact, Staff fails to mention the position of the Village of Mt. Zion in its Initial Brief on Rehearing.

As discussed above, Staff's claim is that using a Moweaqua substation is the "best course" because there is an existing 138 kV line there that runs north to Decatur and south to Pana. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 9-11.) But there are at least three flaws with Staff's argument.

First, Staff admits that the Moweaqua substation provides inferior voltage support to Decatur, compared to its substation site Option #2. (*Id.* at 11.) In fact, Staff substation site Option #2 provides higher post-contingency voltage support to the Decatur area than the Moweaqua site regardless of the combination of 345 kV supply line(s) and 138 kV connections to the Decatur area that ATXI evaluated, whether in 2016 – 2018 or after 2018. (Staff Cross Ex. 2.) Given that the Commission has found a substation necessary in Mt. Zion, it is unclear why Staff would recommend a location with inferior electrical performance in addressing a reliability

issue and physically located many miles away from Mt. Zion.

Second, in order to rectify the first shortcoming, Staff suggests constructing additional 138 kV transmission lines from Moweaqua to Decatur. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 10-11.) This seems counter to Staff's analysis throughout this proceeding of the Pawnee to Mt. Zion portion of the Project, which has focused on reducing the number of miles of new transmission line to be constructed.

Third, Staff fails to consider the situation in Decatur in 2016. Staff argues that post-contingency voltages in Decatur are acceptable when supported by a Moweaqua substation with both a Kincaid connection and a Mt. Zion to Kansas 345 kV line in service. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 10.) But, this is a meaningless argument: the system configuration proposed by Staff will not exist until 2018, given that a Kincaid connection cannot be in service until at least then. Decatur's reliability concerns must be addressed in 2016. Staff's arguments do not address what would happen during a wait between 2016 and 2018 for a Kincaid connection to be built. And even after 2018, the Moweaqua site and 345 kV system configuration proposed by Staff will fail to provide post-contingency voltages above 95% (91.4% with one 138 kV line to Decatur and 93.5% with two 138 kV lines to Decatur)—while connections through Staff substation site Option #2 are all above 95%. (ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (ENG 13.08 Attachs. 2, 4).)

ATXI conducted power flow analyses for assumed conditions in 2016 (not including new ADM load). (ATXI Exs. 4.1RH-4.4RH; ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (ENG 13.08 Attachs. 1, 3, 5, 7).) The analysis assumed completion of either a Pana to Mt. Zion 345 kV line, or an accelerated Kansas to Mt. Zion 345 kV line—the two most likely possibilities to address Decatur reliability in 2016. Since the Kincaid connection cannot be in service until 2018, it was not included in the analysis. The following chart summarizes the model results in 2016:

Table 1: Post-contingency recovery voltages[5] in Decatur.

	2016 345 kV connection from:	
	Pana	***Kansas***
Substation configuration		
Staff substation site Option #2	94.30%[6]	93.70%[7]
Moweaqua with one existing 138 kV connection	90.90%[8]	90.33%[9]
Moweaqua with one existing and one new 138 kV connection	92.90%[10]	92.21%[11]

Staff substation site Option #2 provides better voltage support to Decatur (as does a Pana line as opposed to an accelerated Kansas line). Under all configurations shown, the Moweaqua substation provides inferior voltage support.

Staff criticizes ATXI's power flow analyses above because they "use peak loads in the Decatur area that are expected to exist in 2021, not in 2016 to 2018." (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 10 .) This statement misrepresents the evidence. It is true that the models reflect system conditions expected in 2021, but ATXI explained that these conditions were *also* representative of summer peak (90/10) conditions during the period between 2013 and 2018, before accounting for new ADM load, due to low load growth in that time period. (ICC Staff Cross Ex. 1 (ENG 13.03).) In order to maintain consistency with previous analyses, the modeled load growth does not include the additional ADM load that is expected to occur in 2016, which would increase the peak load above what is modeled. (Staff Cross Ex. 2; Tr. 119.) This expected customer load addition

[5] ATXI considers post-contingency voltages of 95% or higher to be adequate. Between 90% and 95%, the risk of voltage collapse and loss of load increases incrementally as the voltage decreases. (ATXI Ex. 4.0 (RH), p. 7.) Between 89% and 85%, a significant risk of voltage collapse exists, while voltage collapse is virtually certain below 85%. (*Id.*)
[6] ATXI Ex. 4.2 (RH).
[7] ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (Attach. 4).
[8] ATXI Ex. 4.3 (RH).
[9] ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (Attach 7).
[10] ATXI Ex. 4.4 (RH).
[11] ICC Staff Cross Ex. 2 (Attach 5).

increases the concern that the Moweaqua site is deficient to address the Decatur area reliability issues.

Given that Staff has not identified any problems, concerns, or deficiencies associated with its substation site Option #2, and that the interested parties support that site, the Commission should approve Staff substation site Option #2.

C. Pawnee – Mt. Zion

1. Pawnee – Mt. Zion via Kincaid

a. Length of Line

b. Difficulty and Cost of Construction

c. Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance

d. Environmental Impacts

e. Impacts on Historical Resources

f. Social and Land Use Impacts

g. Number of Affected Landowners and other Stakeholders

h. Proximity to Homes and Other Structures

i. Proximity to Existing and Planned Development

j. Community Acceptance

k. Visual Impact

l. Presence of Existing Corridors

2. Pawnee-Mt. Zion via Pana

a. Pawnee-Pana (including Ramey/Reynolds Option)

No party disputes that if a transmission line is deemed necessary between Pawnee and Pana, then ATXI's Alternative Route 2 should be approved. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 24-25; Staff Br. on Rh'g at 16; Raynolds/Ramey Br. on Rh'g at 2-3.) Intervenor Raynolds/Ramey continue to support a modification to this route that would avoid their property. (Raynolds/Ramey Br. on

Rh'g at 2.) Mr. Ramey testified that his proposed modification impacts eight landowners. (Tr. 223-24.) Raynolds/Ramey argues in brief that "all 8 landowners would have been affected by ATXI's alternate routes, and therefore, it is believed that all have been contacted as potentially affected parties." (Raynolds/Ramey Br. on Rh'g at 9.) But Mr. Ramey testified at hearing that two of the eight landowners would be newly affected by the Raynolds/Ramey modification. (Tr. 223.) And Mr. Ramey also admitted that he did not submit a landowner list with his proposed route modification. (*Id.*) So the record is not clear who the Raynolds/Ramey modification would affect, and whether they received notice of this proceeding.

As discussed in ATXI's Initial Brief on Rehearing, the Raynolds/Ramey modification is not problematic from a routing or engineering perspective. However, should the Commission decide not to accept the modification, ATXI will work with Raynolds/Ramey to address site-specific concerns as best it can. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 25.)

Since all parties agree that ATXI's Alternative Route 2 is appropriate and the least-cost route between Pawnee and Pana, it should be approved by the Commission.

i. Length of Line

ii. Difficulty and Cost of Construction

iii. Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance

iv. Environmental Impacts

v. Impacts on Historical Resources

vi. Social and Land Use Impacts

vii. Number of Affected Landowners and other Stakeholders

viii. Proximity to Homes and Other Structures

ix. Proximity to Existing and Planned Development

x. Community Acceptance

xi. Visual Impact

xii. Presence of Existing Corridors

b. Pana – Mt. Zion

The parties' briefs confirm that if the Commission approves a Pawnee to Pana to Mt. Zion route, it should approve the Modified Route[12] from Pana to Mt. Zion. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 30; Staff Br. on Rh'g at 18; MCPO Br. on Rh'g at 10.)

Only the Spragues have a concern about any part of the route; however, their objection to the Modified Route is limited to a relatively small portion simply because it affects their property. (Sprague Br. on Rh'g at 4-5.) The Spragues argue, "ATXI has not met its legally required burden either to adequately describe . . . or to justify utilization" of what the parties call a "hitch" in the route. (*Id.* at 4.) To the contrary, ATXI provided substantial evidence regarding its route selection process: how the route siting analysis was performed (ATXI Exs. 4.0, pp. 4-5; 4.3), how the siting criteria were identified, prioritized and used in evaluating potential routes (ATXI Ex. 4.0, p. 6; 4.4); how and why the Proposed Routes were selected (ATXI Ex. 4.0, pp. 7-13); and it provided legal descriptions for the Primary and Alternate Routes for every portion of the Project (ATXI Ex. 5.3, pp. 20-21). The "hitch" was identified in the maps depicting the Pana to Mt. Zion route filed with the Commission in November 2012. (ATXI Ex. 4.2 (Part 61 of 100), p. 1.) The reason for the hitch is also well documented—to avoid displacing one or two residences. (ATXI Ex. 9.0 (RH), p. 10; Tr. 133, 138-40; 181-83.) It also follows cultivated boundaries to impact properties the least. (Tr. 182.)

Many of the Spragues' concerns (for example, where poles are actually placed and their

[12] The Modified consists of ATXI's Primary Route from the Pana substation until it meets Staff's proposed Kincaid route just north of the Christian/Macon County line. From that point, the route follows Staff's proposed Kincaid route until it meets Staff's substation site Option #2, as shown Figure 4 of ATXI's Initial Brief on Rehearing.

spacing) are related to the final line design—a process that occurs after a Certificate is issued. The exact locations of the individual poles have not yet been determined, and, in fact, will not be determined until the detailed design phase. (ATXI Ex. 16.0 (Rev.), p. 4.) And the exact location of the easement will not be set until the locations of the poles are known. Until that time, ATXI commonly works with landowners, where feasible and appropriate, to adjust pole placement (and thus easement placement) to mitigate many common concerns, such as avoiding center pivot irrigation systems. (*Id.* at 5.) Contrary to the Spragues' assertions, only once the easement location is set is the flexibility to adjust pole locations restricted to up to five feet from the centerline or up to fifty feet between the poles, as Mr. Murbarger testified. (*Id.* at 4.) As already explained in this proceeding, ATXI will coordinate with each landowner on pole placement and will make adjustments where feasible and appropriate to address site-specific concerns. (*Id.* at 5.) Mr. Sprague will not be treated any differently.

i. Length of Line

ii. Difficulty and Cost of Construction

iii. Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance

iv. Environmental Impacts

v. Impacts on Historical Resources

vi. Social and Land Use Impacts

vii. Number of Affected Landowners and other Stakeholders

viii. Proximity to Homes and Other Structures

ix. Proximity to Existing and Planned Development

x. Community Acceptance

xi. Visual Impact

D. Mt. Zion – Kansas

As discussed in ATXI's Initial Brief on Rehearing, the Stipulated Route, incorporating the Commission's previously approved route from Kansas to the Macon/Piatt county line with a slight modification into Staff substation site Option #2 (Route MZK-2), best represents the balance of routing criteria, is best supported by the overall record, and resolves the concerns of the vast majority of the parties affected by the various routes proposed for the Mt. Zion to Kansas portion of the Project. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 35-41.) Staff agrees. (Staff Br. on Rh'g at 20-21.) Of the 16 parties who represent interests or own property along any of the routes proposed from Mt. Zion to Kansas, only PDM/Channon[13] oppose the Stipulated Route. (ATXI Ex. 7.0 (RH), p. 9; Corley Br. on Rh'g; Louise Brock LP Br. on Rh'g.)

There is little meaningful difference between the record in the underlying case and the record now. Although PDM/Channon's briefing is extensive, only four issues reflect possible new developments on rehearing: (1) cost of construction; (2) prime farmland; (3) impacts to Amish communities; and (4) the number of PDM members. Of these, none warrant reversal of the Commission's decision.

Regarding cost, the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route is the least expensive. But the Stipulated Route impacts substantially fewer residences. PDM/Channon argues "a differential in residences of 9 (or even 15), none of which will be displaced, cannot justify the much greater financial cost to ratepayers of the [Stipulated Route]." (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 53.) The Commission has previously found otherwise, determining that avoiding residences may justify a more expense route. *Ill. Power Co.*, Docket 06-0179, Order (May 16, 2007), pp. 16-17 (emphasis added). The evidence shows the Stipulated Route avoids 19 more residences (within 500 feet) at a cost of $17 million, or about $895,000 per house. (MCPO Ex. 2.2 (RH), p. 4.)

[13] Coalition of Property Owners and Interested Parties in Piatt, Douglas and Moultrie Counties and the Channon Family Trust.

And because of MVP cost sharing, the cost per residence borne by customers would be less—only about 9% of the $17 million is paid for by Ameren Illinois area customers.

Regarding prime farmland, the Stipulated Route impacts marginally more acres of prime farmland than the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route. However, the Commission's August 2013 Order acknowledges that, "because the amount of farmland actually taken out of production depends on the placement of poles, it is not known which route will directly impact the least amount of farmland." (Order at 99.) That finding remains true. PDM witness Ms. Burns also introduced a different way of calculating prime farmland using University of Illinois productivity indices, instead of using the USDA and NCRS standards (as ATXI and MCPO do). (PDM Ex. 6.0, pp. 9-13.) The problem with this method is twofold: (1) the parties have analyzed the competing routes for the entire Project, and the Commission has based its routing decisions to date, using the USDA and NCRS standards; and (2) it does not aid in differentiating a route based on farmland impacts. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH), pp. 11-12.)

Regarding impacts to Amish communities, PDM raised concerns regarding potential negative impacts to tourism near Arthur. The testimony on this issue is only speculation about what PDM believes *tourists* will think about seeing a powerline along a road.

Regarding the number of PDM members, the record lacks any evidence supporting its claim that community acceptance can be inferred because PDM's "membership" totals 500. This claim raises more questions than it answers. For instance, what, if anything, do these individuals know about this case? Do they own property along the Stipulated Route? Are they even affected by the Stipulated Route? What are their individual, specific interests? Do they in fact oppose the Stipulated Route?

As ATXI explained in its Initial Brief on Rehearing, the Commission must choose

between a route that is more costly in terms of dollars versus a route that is more costly in terms of residences impacted. Avoiding proximity to significantly more residences tips the scale in favor of the Stipulated Route. Because of these factors, and more importantly the weight of the record, ATXI recommends the Commission re-approve the Stipulated Route, including the connection into Staff substation site Option #2, identified as Route MZK-2.

1. Length of Line

2. Difficulty and Cost of Construction

3. Difficulty and Cost of Operation and Maintenance

4. Environmental Impacts

PDM/Channon argues, "there has already been testimony submitted of specific environmental impacts on the MCPO route [the Stipulated Route]." (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 16-17.) PDM/Channon is correct; however, the Commission has already considered the evidence presented in the underlying case. Moreover, PDM/Channon ignore the evidence on rehearing that shows the Stipulated Route is superior because it impacts fewer acres of wooded areas, minimally disturbed areas and protected habitat than the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route. (MCPO Ex. 1.3 (RH).) Thus, the evidence on rehearing does not support reversal of the Commission's approval of the Stipulated Route.

5. Impacts on Historical Resources

PDM/Channon express concerns regarding impacts to an Amish community and a Native American site that was presented in and considered by the Commission in the underlying case. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 20.) The only new evidence they provide on rehearing is testimony purportedly "from a representative of the Amish community," (*id.* at 19) regarding alleged "negative impacts on tourism" that the Stipulated Route may pose. (PDM Ex. 4.0.) There are two issues with this new "evidence." First, there is no record evidence that this

witness is indeed a representative of the Amish community. In fact, the witness does not even identify himself as such. (*See* PDM Ex. 4.0.) Second, these concerns are purely speculative.

The record does not support the rest of PDM/Channon's arguments either—as they could be applied equally to the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route. For instance, PDM claims the Stipulated Route is much closer to the Amish area in Arthur than the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 18.) However, ATXI Exhibit 13.7 shows that Arthur is about 5 miles from the Stipulated Route and is midway between both the competing routes. (ATXI Ex. 13.7, p. 1.) So it is not clear how any impacts to Arthur will be any worse along the Stipulated Route than along the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route. PDM also claims the Stipulated Route will be an eyesore to visitors to the Arthur area who arrive from the north via Rt. 36 or from the east via Rt. 133. (*Id.* at 19.) But one could also speculate that the same effect would occur for tourists arriving from the west or south across the PDM Hybrid Route on I-57, Rt. 133, or Rt. 45. (ATXI Ex. 13.7 (RH), p. 1.)

Thus, the evidence on rehearing does not support reversal of the Commission's approval of the Stipulated Route for this criterion.

6. Social and Land Use Impacts

PDM/Channon alleges, "MCPO's assertion in the underlying case that its routing affected fewer prime acres than ATXI's routing [ATXI's proposed Primary and Alternate Routes], which the Commission relied on, was simply false." (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 22.) This claim is misleading. ATXI and MCPO used the same definition to identify prime farmland. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH), p. 6.) PDM witness Ms. Burns used a different method of calculating prime farmland (productivity indexes), so it is not surprising that the results would differ. As MCPO witness Mr. Reinecke explained, ATXI and MCPO used the USDA and NRCS standards to determine the amount of prime farmland impacted by the various routes. (*Id.* at 12.) The USDA and NRCS

standards are more sensitive with regard to accounting for the differences in the soils than PDM/Channon's method, which concludes that two geographically separate routes of different lengths have exactly the same percentage of prime farmlands. (*Id.*)

PDM/Channon also complain that the Stipulated Route splits more farms than its route and places multiple angle structures within a single farm tract. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 22-24.) PDM/Channon cites to *Ness v. Ill. Comm. Comm'n,* 67 Ill. 2d 250, 253 (1977) to insinuate that the Illinois Supreme Court will reverse a Commission decision that approves a route that "does not follow fence lines and splits the affected farms." (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 23.) But the *only* criterion used in *Ness* to compare competing routes was environmental impact. *Ness,* 67 Ill. 2d 250, 251-52. Thus, it is not applicable to cases where the Commission considers others factors as well, such as this case. *Ameropan Oil Corp. v. Ill. Comm. Comm'n*, 298 Ill. App. 3d 341 (1st Dist. 1998.) Further, MCPO points out that the vast majority of the transmission line structures will be placed on farmland, whether near the property boundaries or in the middle of the field. (MCPO Ex. 2.0 (RH), p. 13.) So, these concerns are not unique, and all of the farm tracts will be negatively impacted regardless of which route is selected.

7. Number of Affected Landowners and other Stakeholders

8. Proximity to Homes and Other Structures

PDM/Channon argue MCPO's residential counts cannot be trusted. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 54.) Ms. Murphy testified that after the August 2013 Order, she flew over and inspected the rehearing routes, including the Stipulated Route, to verify her structure counts and residential occupancy. (ATXI Ex. 3.0 (RH), p. 17; Tr. 150-51.) Members of Ms. Murphy's team also drove the routes. (ATXI Ex. 3.0 (RH), p. 17.) The results of this process are contained in ATXI Exhibit 3.1 (RH), which states, "Structure types were identified based on aerial interpretation and field reconnaissance." (*Id.* at 4, fn. 66.) MCPO witness Mr. Reinecke used

ATXI's verified information with respect to the proximity to homes and structures. (MCPO Br. on Rh'g at 39.)

In brief, PDM/Channon identifies houses MCPO "missed," but many are more than 500 feet from the Stipulated Route. They argue MCPO's data underlying the structure and residential counts is so uncertain that the Commission should not rely upon it. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 54.) But PDM/Channon ignores evidence presented by ATXI *and* Staff that shows that the Stipulated Route impacts the least residences, by far. (ATXI Ex. 3.1 (RH); ICC Staff Ex. 4.0, pp. 15-16.) What their brief highlights is that residential counts may vary when parties do not use the same analysis corridor to measure potential impacts. For instance, ATXI and MCPO measured impacts within 500 feet, Staff measured within 400 feet, and PDM measured within 530 feet. (ATXI Br. on Rh'g at 40; MCPO Br. on Rh'g at 39; Tr. 358; PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 33.) Moreover, since MCPO and ATXI routes were analyzed using a 500-foot corridor, PDM/Channon cannot now argue that a house 530 feet away was somehow "missed." Further, ATXI developed the residential counts for the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route off this same 500-foot corridor. If ATXI had used a 530-foot corridor, the number of impacted residences along the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route would presumably increase. Regardless of whose count is used or the distance used to measure, the Stipulated Route impacts far fewer residences than the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route.

9. Proximity to Existing and Planned Development

10. Community Acceptance

PDM argues the Commission should reverse its decision and approve the PDM/Channon Hybrid Route based on the number of its members. PDM claims to include "over 500 intervenors from every affected community and rural area along the MCPO route," all of which oppose the Stipulated Route. (PDM/Channon Br. on Rh'g at 56.) However, there is no record

verification for this claim and the Commission cannot rely on it as an indication of community acceptance. There is no record evidence of the interests of those named—whether, for example, they all own property on Stipulated Route or are otherwise actually impacted by the Stipulated Route. No testimony or other evidence confirms that each of the 500 does, in fact, oppose the Stipulated Route. Simply put, PDM's position asks the Commission to disregard the compromises made by the parties in lieu of a list of names and addresses.

11. Visual Impact

12. Presence of Existing Corridors

V. Certificate for Other Substations

A. Resolved

1. Kansas Substation Site

2. Rising Substation Site

B. Contested

1. Ipava Substation Site

Staff and ATXI continue to agree that the buildable area at the existing AIC Ipava substation cannot house substation equipment for more than four 345 kV connections. (ICC Staff Ex. 3.0, p. 13.) AIC's existing Ipava substation currently has two connections to its 345 kV bus, and the Project would add a third. (ATXI Init. Br. 43.) Staff's recommended configuration would leave only one spare connection location for future use. But Staff does not dispute the reasonableness of ATXI's conclusion that connections, in addition to and beyond the Project, will be made at Ipava will in the future. (ICC Staff Init. Br. 24.)

In light of these expected future connections, ATXI proposes to construct a new substation with a four connection ring bus, but capable of expansion to accept up to six connections in the future. (ATXI Init. Br. 43-44.) The current substation does not have space

for such an expansion. (ATXI Ex. 2.0(RH), p. 13.) It would be uneconomical and inefficient to require ATXI to install equipment at the existing Ipava substation to its maximum capacity, only to have a second, brand-new substation become necessary in the future. Instead, it is more rational to relocate the existing Ipava substation equipment to a new larger space now, while property is available and before the need for additional connections is imminent. The Commission should approve ATXI's proposed Ipava substation.

2. Pana Substation Site

Staff agrees that, if the Commission approves a Pana connection, ATXI's proposed substation site is not objectionable.

Dated: January 7, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois

By: /s/ Albert D. Sturtevant

One of their Attorneys

Edward C. Fitzhenry
Matthew R. Tomc
Eric E. Dearmont
AMEREN SERVICES COMPANY
One Ameren Plaza
1901 Chouteau Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63166
(314) 554-3533
(314) 554-4014 (fax)
efitzhenry@ameren.com
mtomc@ameren.com
edearmont@ameren.com

Mark A. Whitt
Shannon K. Rust
WHITT STURTEVANT LLP
88 East Broad Street, Suite 1590
Columbus, Ohio 43215
(614) 224-3911
whitt@whitt-sturtevant.com
rust@whitt-sturtevant.com

Albert D. Sturtevant
Anne M. Zehr
Rebecca L. Segal
Hanna M. Conger
WHITT STURTEVANT LLP
180 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 2001
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(312) 251-3017
sturtevant@whitt-sturtevant.com
zehr@whitt-sturtevant.com
segal@whitt-sturtevant.com
conger@whitt-sturtevant.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Albert Sturtevant, an attorney, certify that January 7, 2014, I caused a copy of the foregoing *Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois' Reply Brief on Rehearing* to be served by electronic mail to the individuals on the Commission's Service List for Docket 12-0598.

/s/ Albert D. Sturtevant
Attorney for Ameren Transmission
Company of Illinois